

### **Remarks**

The Applicant has cancelled Claims 35-68 and replaced those cancelled claims with new Claims 69-81. The new claims are a more compact set of claims generally based on the original claims but having been clarified to better convey the intended subject matter. Also, the main method system and device claims additionally recite that the first modified stream includes a modified Prediction coded image, which is modified from the at least one Prediction coded image so that the resulting video sequence is visually altered. Support for this additional clarifying feature may be found in the Applicant's original Specification in paragraph [0086], for example. Entry of the new claims into the official file and consideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 35, 38, 42-44, 46-53, 56-57, 59-64 and 68 stand rejected under nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over Claims 1, 4, 7-9, 11-13, 18-21, 23-27 of the US Patent No. 7,327,936. The Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is now moot in view of the cancellation of those claims. Nonetheless, the Applicant will address this issue as it might theoretically apply to any or all of new Claims 69-81.

Reference to the new claims shows that the I frame is not modified. Instead, only the predictive claims (P or B) are modified. This is sharply different from US 7,327,936 which is directed to a method of modifying blocks within an I frame. It can readily be seen that these two features are quite different and are, accordingly, anything but obvious over one another. Withdrawal of the double-patenting rejection based on US 7,327,936 is accordingly respectfully requested.

Claims 35-68 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 over the hypothetical combination of Shamoon with Falcon. The Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's detailed comments

hypothetically applying that combination against those claims. The Applicant respectfully submits, however, that the rejection is now moot in view of the cancellation of those claims. However, the Applicant will address the hypothetical combination as it hypothetically applies against new Claims 69-81.

Falcon discloses that the concatenation of data blocks represent a digital representation as discussed in column 3, at lines 17-20, and each data block is associated with an X stripe. This is sharply different from Claims 69-81 inasmuch as the concatenation of the I frames does not represent the digital representation. This may be seen by reference to Claim 69, which recites that the digital stream comprises different types of frames, specifically the I and P/B frames. Thus, Falcon is inapplicable. Moreover, the Applicant respectfully submits that hypothetically combining Shamoon with Falcon fails to cure this deficiency. Thus, even if one skilled in the art were to make the hypothetical combination, the result of that combination would still be different from the subject matter of Claims 69-81. However, there is yet another difference.

The Applicant's claims recite that the modification is made to the predictive frame. This modification means that the resulting GOP (group of picture) is visually altered. This is specified in the method, system and device claims which specifically recite "that the resulting video sequence is visually altered." The Applicants respectfully submit that both of Falcon and Shamoon fail to disclose, teach or suggest this claimed aspect. As a consequence, the Applicant respectfully submits that a hypothetical combination of Shamoon with Falcon would also fail to result in this specifically-claimed aspect. As a consequence, the combination is inapplicable to Claims 69-81. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that the entire Application is now in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



T. Daniel Christenbury  
Reg. No. 31,750  
Attorney for Applicant

TDC/vp  
(215) 656-3381